

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application; claims 1, 8, and 10 being independent. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in light of the remarks contained herein.

The Official Action

In the Office Action dated April 24, 2002, the Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting Figs. 10-13 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". Further, the Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Toshio et al.* (JP 9-199756).

Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings, asserting Figs. 10-13 should be designated by a legend such as "Prior Art". Applicant has submitted herewith a Drawing Correction Authorization Request requesting the legend "Prior Art" be added to Figs. 10-13. Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the Examiner's objections based upon these submissions.

The Examiner further objected to the drawings, asserting the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. The Examiner asserted the feature recited in claim 4, namely that the structures of the two light emitting elements are different from each other, must be shown in the drawings. Included in the Drawing Correction Authorization Request is a request to submit new drawing 7A, which is substantially similar to the photocoupling device depicted in Fig. 7 except that light emitting element 1a is

depicted in a different manner than light emitting element 1b. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been added by the submission of this new figure and support for the subject matter contained in Fig. 7A can be found in the specification on page 19. Based upon the submission of new Fig. 7A, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Toshio et al.* Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner asserts *Toshio et al.* teaches an output section having a light receiving element 11 opposed to light emitting faces of the light emitting elements and lead terminals 10 for supplying a drive current to the light receiving element.

It is respectfully submitted that *Toshio et al.* teaches a reflection-type optical coupling system. As can be seen in Fig. 1(b), Toshio teaches an LED element 2A mounted on an LED array chip 2. Light emitted from the LED element 2A reflects off optical coupling layer 20 and is received at a light receiving element part 11 mounted on lead frame 10. ✓

In contrast, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, a photocoupling device comprising an output section having a light receiving element opposed to light emitting faces of the light emitting elements. It is respectfully submitted that *Toshio et al.* does not teach a light receiving element being opposed to light emitting faces of the light emitting elements. As such, since *Toshio et al.* fails to anticipate all of the elements of the present invention set forth in claim 1, claim 1 is allowable over *Toshio et al.* ✓

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-7 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 based upon their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claims 8 and 10 contain elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. It is further submitted that claim 9 is allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 8 based upon its dependency on claim 8.

CONCLUSION

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Provisional Reg. No. P-52,327) at the telephone number below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By


Terrell C. Birch, #19,382

TCB/CMV/jdm
1247-0441P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

Attachment: Version With Markings to Show Changes Made

VERSION WITH MARKING TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

IN THE SPECIFICATION:

Please insert the following new paragraph on page 12, line 13:

--Fig. 7A is a transverse sectional view showing still another embodiment of a photocoupling device of the invention;--

Please replace the paragraph beginning on page 19, line 13, with the following rewritten paragraph:

--In order to thus mount two light emitting elements 1a and 1b on one header 9b, two kinds of light emitting elements which have different structures (substrates) are used as the light emitting elements 1a and 1b as shown in Fig. 7A. That is to say, one is a light emitting element in which an n-substrate is used, and the other is a light emitting element in which a p-substrate is used. Here, it is also possible to use light emitting elements having the same structure (for example, the same substrate) by putting one of them upside down as shown in Fig. 7.--